UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,991	08/27/2003	Christopher K. Karstens	RSW920020083US1	4362

			EXAMINER
48816	7590	03/06/2006	DAYE, CHELCIE L

VAN LEEUWEN & VAN LEEUWEN
P.O. BOX 90609
AUSTIN, TX 78709-0609

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/648,991	KARSTENS, CHRISTOPHER K.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chelcie Daye	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 August 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 August 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/27/03*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is issued in response to Application filed on August 27, 2003.

2.   Claims 1-25 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on August 27, 2003 was

filed on the mailing date of the application. The submission is in compliance with the

provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being

considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

4.   Claims 1,4,8,11,14,17,and 21-25 are objected to because of the following

informalities: "determining whether to adjust". Examiner is unsure of what the outcome

would be if the user selects not to adjust. Applicant only gives a scenario when the

determining factor is chosen to adjust. Examiner believes inappropriate claim language

is used. Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   **Claims 1-5,8-12,14-18, and 21-25, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as**

being unpatentable over Richomme (US Patent Application No. 20030235279) filed

on March 26, 2003, in view of Slutsman (US Patent No. 6,604,129) filed on March

25, 1999 and further in view of Nishizawa (US Patent Application No.

20020004734) filed on January 19, 2001.

Regarding Claims 1,8, and 14, Richomme discloses a method for

dynamically adjusting an agenda using a computer system, said method

comprising:

an agenda management tool for dynamically adjusting an agenda ([0009],

lines 2-5, Richomme), the agenda adjustment tool comprising software code

effective to ([0024], lines 9-11, Richomme):

receive a request ([0023], lines 7-12, Richomme), the request

corresponding to a first agenda item from a plurality of agenda items included in

the agenda ([0029], lines 1-4, Richomme)[1]; and

retrieve one or more first agenda item attributes corresponding to the first

agenda item ([0030], lines 1-3, Richomme)[2]. On the other hand, Richomme does

not explicitly disclose wherein the method comprises determining whether to

adjust one or more of the first agenda item attributes based upon the request and

---

[1] Examiner Notes: Fig.2, items "GISSUE", "SISSUE1", and "SISSUE2" correspond to the plurality of
agenda items within an agenda and "GISSUE" corresponds to the first agenda item.
[2] Examiner Notes: Fig.2, items T1,T2, and T3 are attributes of the agenda items. Therefore, T1 is the
attribute, which corresponds to the first agenda item. Also, the attributes are displayed on the GUI, which
corresponds to the act of retrieving.

adjusting one or more of the first agenda item attributes in response to the determination. However, Slutsman discloses determining whether to adjust one or more of the first agenda item attributes based upon the request (column 3, lines 19-26, Slutsman)[3] and adjusting one or more of the first agenda item attributes in response to the determination (column 3, lines 26-33, Slutsman). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Slutsman's teachings into the Richomme system. Although, Richomme does briefly discuss adjusting agenda items, he does not go into great detail about the action taken in order to get to the final results. Therefore, a skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine the two references, as suggested by Slutsman at column 3, lines 9-13, in order to further ensure that a complete and understandable conference request is sent and received. Richomme and Slutsman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of multi-participant conferences with agendas. As a result of adjusting, this regulates the items within the agenda so as to achieve accuracy and conform to a standard form of the meeting.

Richomme in view of Slutsman are both performed over the Web (i.e. the Internet which is accessed through a computer system), which is silent with respect to the system having one or more processors; a memory accessible by the processors; and one or more nonvolatile storage devices accessible by the processors. However, Nishizawa discloses the system having one or more

---

[3] Examiner Notes: "Modifying" corresponds to adjusting.

processors ([0034], lines 3-4, Nishizawa)[4]; a memory accessible by the

processors (Fig.1, item 12, Nishizawa); and one or more nonvolatile storage

devices accessible by the processors (Fig.1, item 14, Nishizawa). Nishizawa

explicitly discloses the multiple elements along with staying with the field of

endeavor of schedule managing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Nishizawa's teachings

into the Richomme in view of Slutsman system. A skilled artisan would have

been motivated to combine as suggested by Nishizawa at paragraph [0034],

lines 11-18, in order to provide a proper information equipment which permits the

system to operate.

Regarding Claims 2,9, and 15, the combination of Richomme in view of

Slutsman, and further in view of Nishizawa, disclose the method wherein at least

one of the first agenda item attributes are selected from the group consisting of a

start time, an end time, a progress indicator, a timeslot ([0030], lines 1-3,

Richomme), a time window, and a font property.

Regarding Claims 3,10, and 16, the combination of Richomme in view of

Slutsman, and further in view of Nishizawa, disclose the method further

comprising:

---

[4] Examiner Notes: "CPU" corresponds to a processor.

identifying one or more first agenda item participants corresponding to the

first agenda item (Fig.2, "Participants"; [0021], lines 3-7, Richomme)[5]; and

notifying one or more of the first agenda item participants in response to

the adjusting ([0022], lines 4-5, Richomme).

Regarding Claims 4,11, and 17, the combination of Richomme in view of

Slutsman, and further in view of Nishizawa, discloses the method further

comprising:

identifying a second agenda item from the plurality of agenda items

([0029], lines 1-4, Richomme)[6], wherein the second agenda item is subsequent

to the first agenda item (Fig.2; Richomme)[7];

determining whether to change one or more second agenda item

attributes corresponding to the second agenda item in response to the adjusting

(column 3, lines 19-26, Slutsman)[8]; and

changing one or more of the second agenda item attributes in response to

the determining (column 3, lines 26-33, Slutsman).

Regarding Claims 5,12, and 18, the combination of Richomme in view of

Slutsman, and further in view of Nishizawa, discloses the method further

comprising:

---

[5] Examiner Notes: The act of identifying corresponds to "providing".
[6] Examiner Notes: The second agenda item corresponds to "SISSUE1".
[7] Examiner Notes: The second agenda item occurs after (i.e. subsequent) the first agenda item.
[8] Examiner Notes: The second agenda item attribute corresponds to "T2" (Fig.2; Richomme).

detecting that the request is an agenda item order change request ([0053], lines 25-29, Nishizawa), the agenda item order change request corresponding to a new agenda order ([0035], lines 10-13, Nishizawa);

analyzing the new agenda order ([0056], lines 6-9, Nishizawa), the analyzing including identifying a second agenda item whose timeslot requires changing in response to the new agenda order ([0056], lines 9-18, Nishizawa);

changing the second agenda's timeslot in response to the analyzing ([0056], lines 18-22, Nishizawa); and

notifying one or more participants in response to the changing ([0039], lines 17-22, Richomme).

Regarding Claims 21,23, and 24, the combination of Richomme in view of Slutsman, and further in view of Nishizawa, discloses an information handling system comprising:

one or more processors ([0034], lines 3-4, Nishizawa);

a memory accessible by the processors (Fig.1, item 12, Nishizawa);

one or more nonvolatile storage devices accessible by the processors (Fig.1, item 14, Nishizawa); and

an agenda management tool for dynamically adjusting an agenda ([0009], lines 2-5, Richomme), the agenda adjustment tool comprising software code effective to ([0024], lines 9-11, Richomme):

receive a request ([0023], lines 7-12, Richomme), the request corresponding to a first agenda item from a plurality of agenda items included in the agenda ([0029], lines 1-4, Richomme);

retrieve one or more first agenda item attributes corresponding to the first agenda item ([0030], lines 1-3, Richomme), wherein at least one of the first agenda item attributes are selected from the group consisting of a start time, an end time, a progress indicator, a timeslot ([0030], lines 1-3, Richomme), a time window, and a font property;

determine whether to adjust one or more of the first agenda item attributes based upon the request (column 3, lines 19-26, Slutsman);

adjust one or more of the first agenda item attributes in response to the determination (column 3, lines 26-33, Slutsman);

identify one or more first agenda item participants corresponding to the first agenda item (Fig.2, "Participants"; [0021], lines 3-7, Richomme); and

notify one or more of the first agenda item participants in response to the adjusting ([0022], lines 4-5, Richomme).

Regarding Claims 22 and 25, the combination of Richomme in view of Slutsman, and further in view of Nishizawa, discloses the method for dynamically adjusting an agenda using a computer system, said method comprising:

receiving a request ([0023], lines 7-12, Richomme), the request

corresponding to a first agenda item from a plurality of agenda items included in

the agenda ([0029], lines 1-4, Richomme);

detecting that the request is an agenda item order change request ([0053],

lines 25-29, Nishizawa), the agenda item order change request corresponding to

a new agenda order ([0035], lines 10-13, Nishizawa);

retrieving one or more first agenda item attributes corresponding to the

first agenda item ([0030], lines 1-3, Richomme), wherein at least one of the first

agenda item attributes are selected from the group consisting of a start time, an

end time, a progress indicator, a timeslot ([0030], lines 1-3, Richomme), a time

window, and a font property;

determining whether to adjust one or more of the first agenda item

attributes based upon the request (column 3, lines 19-26, Slutsman);

adjusting one or more of the first agenda item attributes in response to the

determination (column 3, lines 26-33, Slutsman);

analyzing the new agenda order ([0056], lines 6-9, Nishizawa), the

analyzing including identifying a second agenda item whose timeslot requires

changing in response to the new agenda order ([0056], lines 9-18, Nishizawa);

changing the second agenda's timeslot in response to the analyzing

([0056], lines 18-22, Nishizawa); and

notifying one or more participants in response to the changing ([0039],

lines 17-22, Richomme).

7.   **Claims 6,7,13,19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Richomme (US Patent Application No. 20030235279) filed on

March 26, 2003, in view of Slutsman (US Patent No. 6,604,129) filed on March 25,

1999 and further in view of Nishizawa (US Patent Application No. 20020004734)

filed on January 19, 2001, as applied to claims 1-5,8-12,14-18, and 21-25 above,

and further in view of Salesky (US Patent No. 6,343,313) filed on March 25, 1997.

Regarding Claims 6,13, and 19, the combination of Richomme in view of

Slutsman, and further in view of Nishizawa, discloses all of the claimed subject

matter as stated above. However, Richomme in view of Slutsman, and further in

view of Nishizawa, disclose allowing potential participants to send a response

which contains a session ID, which would authorize the method further

comprising receiving a subscription request from a participant, the subscription

request associated with an entry point that corresponds to the first agenda item;

selecting the first agenda item; notifying the participant in response to the

selecting; and subscribing the participant in response to the notifying. On the

other hand, Salesky discloses receiving a subscription request from a participant

(column 8, lines 12-15, Salesky)[9], the subscription request associated with an

entry point that corresponds to the first agenda item (column 15, lines 3-6,

---

[9] Examiner Notes: "Join" corresponds to subscription.

Salesky); selecting the first agenda item (column 2, lines 39-41, Salesky);

notifying the participant in response to the selecting (column 18, lines 18-20,

`Salesky)[10]; and subscribing the participant in response to the notifying (column

14, lines 65-67, Salesky). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Salesky's teaching into the

Richomme in view of Slutsman and further in view of Nishizawa system. A skilled

artisan would have been motivated to combine, as suggested by Salesky at

column 2, lines 10-21, in order to first determine whether the participant was

allowed access to the meeting and if so, exactly what their privileges were and

what role they played in the meeting. As a result, this allows the system to be

more flexible and understanding for those participants whom may be running late

or needed to disconnect temporarily, and is now trying to rejoin, all in all, more

user-friendly.

Regarding Claims 7 and 20, the combination of Richomme in view of

Slutsman, further in view of Nishizawa, and further in view of Salesky, disclose

the method further comprising:

modifying a progress indicator based upon the request (column 14, lines

60-63, Salesky), wherein the modifying corresponds to the progress of the first

agenda item (column 18, lines 22-26, Salesky).

---

[10] Examiner Notes: The act of notifying corresponds to "verifying" and "authorizing".

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chelcie Daye whose telephone number is 571-272-3891. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chelcie Daye
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
February 22, 2006